

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
6 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

7 MATTHEW SCOTT WHITE, }  
8 Plaintiff, }  
9 v. }  
10 RENE BAKER et al., }  
11 Defendants. }  
12 \_\_\_\_\_ }

3:15-cv-00262-RCJ-VPC

**ORDER**

13 **I. DISCUSSION**

14 Plaintiff has filed a motion for reconsideration on this Court's screening order. (ECF No.  
15 14, 15, 23). A motion to reconsider must set forth "some valid reason why the court should  
16 reconsider its prior decision" and set "forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to  
17 persuade the court to reverse its prior decision." *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F.Supp.2d  
18 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2003). Reconsideration is appropriate if this Court "(1) is presented with  
19 newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly  
20 unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." *Sch. Dist. No. 1J v. Acands,*  
21 *Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). "A motion for reconsideration is not an avenue to  
22 re-litigate the same issues and arguments upon which the court already has ruled." *Brown v.*  
23 *Kinross Gold, U.S.A.*, 378 F.Supp.2d 1280, 1288 (D. Nev. 2005).

24 The Court has reviewed its screening order and follow up order (ECF No. 14, 15) and  
25 finds that the decision is not manifestly unjust and that no clear error has been committed.  
26 The Court denies the motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 23).

27 ///

28 ///

